

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, first I want to commend President Obama for thinking long and hard about the course that he believes the United States should take in Afghanistan. That kind of deliberation is a welcome change from the previous administration. I also want to commend him for making it crystal clear that the United States of America condemns torture.

Unfortunately, on the issue of troop levels in Afghanistan, I believe the President has reached the wrong conclusion. Sending 30,000 more U.S. troops to Afghanistan will make it 30,000 times harder to extricate ourselves from this mess. If our fight is truly with al Qaeda, then we're in the wrong country. They have moved to Pakistan. Indeed, General Jones has told us that there are maybe less than 100 al Qaeda members in Afghanistan. With the troop increase announced by the President last night, we will have over 100,000 U.S. service men and women in Afghanistan. Do we really need 100,000 troops to go after less than a hundred al Qaeda?

President Karzai is corrupt and incompetent. He cheated in the most recent election. By most estimates, 30 percent of his votes was rigged. I don't want any more American service men or women to risk their lives for his corrupt government; and I am a little bit stunned, quite frankly, by the quick and inexplicable pivot by the administration from rightly denouncing Karzai's behavior to now embracing him as our dear friend. I think our support for Karzai actually discredits us with the Afghan people. We have seen that it is exceedingly difficult to train Afghan troops, many of whom are not only illiterate, but unable to add or subtract.

The cost of this escalation will be enormous, both in terms of blood and treasure. We will need to borrow billions and billions of additional dollars to pay for this policy.

Madam Speaker, at a time of great economic crisis here in the United States, I would suggest that rather than nation-building in Afghanistan, we should do a little more nation-building here at home.

It is important to note that the so-called timeline outlined by the President last night envisions the beginning of drawing down our troops in July of 2011—the beginning, not the end. Does anybody really believe that we will not be deeply ensnared in Afghanistan well beyond 2011?

Madam Speaker, I do not and I never will suggest that we abandon the Afghan people. They have suffered greatly over the last several decades. We must continue to support meaningful economic development and political assistance.

But finally, Madam Speaker, there is another important issue here, and that is congressional involvement. I know the President last night cited the resolution to authorize force in 2001 as pro-

viding the authority that he needs. I would argue that it was not Congress' intent in 2001 to authorize decades of nation-building in Afghanistan. We voted to go after the people who committed the horrible atrocities on September 11. I would urge that before a single additional troop is sent, that the United States Congress have the chance to fully debate his proposal and have an up-or-down vote.

Under the Bush administration, what usually happened is that additional troops were deployed and then later, once they were already in theater, the administration would submit a supplemental request. That is backwards. We should debate and vote on this critical issue before we send additional troops.

□ 1800

And, Madam Speaker, this is a big deal. This is a major escalation and Congress has a major role to play. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue to ask the tough questions and to continue to play our constitutional role.

CLIMATEGATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARAMENDI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks, evidence has come to light of fraud and corruption in the global warming scientific community. Or, as it is now called, the climate change community.

These shady scientists have made claims of a global warming apocalypse and created fear in the world that we are all doomed because man is the enemy destroyer of planet Earth.

But now thousands of their emails were recently leaked to the public. These emails, written by scientists at the British University of East Anglia exposed fraud and corruption in their global warming claims. Now Climategate is being exposed. These snake oil salesmen have been caught in their lies to the world. These are the very scientists who formed the foundation for world global warming claims. American politicians, the United Nations, everyone claiming that the world is headed toward this global warming catastrophe based their views on this information.

In these emails, these scientists conspired to destroy their own email discussion of data that contradicts their global warming claims. They discussed discrediting members of the scientific community who disagree with them. They even wish some of these dissenting scientists were beaten. Now isn't that lovely when you have an opposition.

Phil Jones, the director of the climate research unit at the University of East Anglia in England wrote in his now-leaked emails of thwarting access to the data by those who doubt global warming. He talked about getting

around British Freedom of Information requests. He didn't want other scientists to get his data because they could expose flaws and faults in his global warming claims.

But the bread and butter of these global warming claims comes from what these scientists say is "consensus" within the scientific community. Now we learn there is not a consensus about global climate change. The emails show numerous actions taken to silence the dissenting voices and withhold the actual information being used to make their questionable claims.

The British university says they are going to release all of their data now, but the scientists have already admitted that they destroyed much of that data. Obviously, they destroyed the data that shows their theory on climate change is a ruse. It is a fraud on the world. That doesn't look like sound science to me. It sounds like they have cooked the books. It sounds like they have picked out an outcome and are trying to fix the data to make it say what they want it to say. It sounds like a political agenda.

World economies depend on these claims that have clearly been manipulated. The U.N. global warming summit in Copenhagen that starts next Monday, December 7, is using this tainted information. The United Nations wants to exert more control over world energy and emissions, and the sovereignty of nations using information that is apparently now faulty. It is tainted with scandal, and it is deceitful.

How can the American people trust any of these claims when they have clearly been manipulated? Well, the American public can be fooled no longer by these pseudo scientists. One may ask why would these scientists skew the facts? Well, it is obvious. Governments all over the world give climate change individuals in the climate change crowd millions of dollars of money to study climate change. And if manmade climate change is a falsehood, these scientists may fear that their money will dry up.

The jury is still out on the global warming theory and the climate change myth. Before Congress passes any legislation based on this theory regarding manmade climate change, we ought to have an open, honest debate from real scientists who didn't manipulate the evidence to get an outcome-based conclusion. Further, the EPA should halt all carbon emission regulations of the energy community until we learn the facts about climate change. Honesty is a prerequisite for conclusions about climate change legislation. And now we learn that climate change is not a well settled scientific fact at all, whether the mad scientists at the University of Anglia like that fact or not.

And that's just the way it is.

HIV/AIDS PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on World AIDS Day, the administration announced its proposed 5-year strategy for the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, otherwise known as PEPFAR. The strategy is required by the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008. That is a mighty long name, but it does so much good. And it begins to shift PEPFAR from an emergency program to one focused on sustainability.

Mr. Speaker, the challenges in fighting HIV/AIDS are daunting, but not insurmountable. Over 33 million people worldwide are infected, an estimated 67 percent of whom live in Sub-Saharan Africa. Nearly 2.7 million people, including 430,000 children, were newly diagnosed with HIV last year. Over 14 million children have lost one or both parents to HIV/AIDS. AIDS is decimating an entire generation of the most productive members of society in developing countries, which will cause GDP to drop by more than 20 percent in the hardest-hit countries over the next decade.

Without effective prevention, treatment, and care efforts, the AIDS pandemic will continue to spread its mix of death, poverty, and despondency that is destabilizing governments and societies and undermining the security of entire regions.

But one need not travel to Africa or the Caribbean or Eastern Europe to witness the devastation of HIV/AIDS; we need only to look out the front door. In my home State of Florida, Mr. Speaker, an estimated 90,000 people are living with HIV/AIDS, making us third in the Nation in the number of AIDS cases.

My home county of Miami-Dade ranks second among large metropolitan areas for people living with AIDS with over 32,000 currently diagnosed. These individuals need our assistance. They are fighting this disease.

On October 21 of this year, with a bipartisan majority, we voted in Congress to reauthorize the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Extension Act. The Ryan White program has been the largest supplier of services for those living with HIV/AIDS in the United States. In the United States, over 500,000 people a year benefit from the Ryan White program. Florida alone received over \$209 million in funding with Ryan White funds in 2009, and has been able to assist countless low-income Americans living with HIV/AIDS.

Fully appreciative of the challenges here at home, I am proud to have supported PEPFAR since its inception. To date, it has proven to be a highly effective and results-oriented program. For example, more than half of the 4 million people receiving lifesaving drugs

in low- and middle-income countries around the world are directly supported through PEPFAR. PEPFAR has supported care for more than 10 million people affected by HIV/AIDS, including more than 10 million orphans and vulnerable children. At least 240,000 babies have been born free of HIV/AIDS thanks to PEPFAR prevention of mother-to-child transmissions.

The achievements of our bilateral programs are truly remarkable. However, the record of our multilateral organizations is problematic. While we need more robust burden sharing—particularly as the World Health Organization has revised its guidelines and vastly expanded the pool of people who require access to treatment—significant revelations of corruption in the global fund programs are cause for great concern.

Mr. Speaker, we must work together to ensure accountability, transparency, and maximum effectiveness of multilateral programs that are receiving United States support. We must work to ensure that every dime that is dedicated to PEPFAR, including our contributions to the global fund, is used for its intended purposes and delivered in the most effective, transparent, and sustainable manner possible. We must ensure that those precious resources actually reach those who are in need, without being diverted to line the pockets of unaccountable international bureaucrats or corrupt regimes.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, we must also preserve the conscience clause and promote behavior modification, particularly abstinence and fidelity, under the new strategy.

In closing, let us recommit ourselves to saving the future by helping to save lives inflicted with HIV/AIDS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICAN TROOPS IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, after the tragedy of 9/11, I voted for the resolution that authorized military action against those who attacked us, including sending our troops into Afghanistan. We sent a strong, unified message that we will never yield to terrorism. We have not just the right but the duty to keep America secure. I certainly agreed with taking out Osama bin Laden. It is outrageous that the Bush-Cheney-Rumsfeld administration failed to stop him, unnecessarily prolonged this conflict, strengthened our enemies as their attention and our resources

were diverted to an ideologically driven invasion of Iraq.

Surely all Americans should respond affirmatively to President Obama's call last night for unity of purpose in keeping our families secure and overcoming all of those who would do us harm. I agree with so very much of what President Obama said, but not so much with what and how he said he would accomplish our shared goal.

It is true he had no really good and easy alternatives, and I applaud his deliberative effort. But the path to peace and security will not be found through a wider war. It is wholly unrealistic to expect that we can escalate our military forces in the harsh, faraway landscape of Afghanistan by another 40 percent, then deescalate and begin bringing them home all within a mere 18 months.

We have been fighting in Afghanistan on the installment plan. A few more troops, a few more months, and a whole lot more money—billions. There is no way that 2011 will mark the end of this war or even the beginning of the end. This is just a mirage. In 18 months the reasons may vary, but the next installment will be requested in what is already a deteriorating war that has lasted 8 years with the illusive end of the war always just over the horizon.

The better exit strategy is to have fewer troops who need to exit. We should honor the sacrifice of those who are courageously serving and put fewer of them into harm's way. It should not take 100,000 highly equipped and trained American troops to defeat less than 100 al Qaeda in Afghanistan, an estimate yesterday from the President's National Security Adviser.

Once again, we hear talk of a grand coalition, but make no mistake, it is Americans who are being asked to bear the overwhelming share of the burden. As these troops would arrive in Afghanistan, the Canadians, the Dutch, they have already announced they will be bringing their troops home at the same time our people get there.

□ 1815

The French and the Germans have said not one more troop. Spain may increase its total to 1,200. Iceland has two, Luxembourg has nine. Every bit of help counts certainly, but it's clear that the great amount of blood that will be spilt will, once again, be American, and the cost will be to the American taxpayer.

Now, United States Army doctrine, as written by General Petraeus, calls for one counterinsurgent for every 50 members of the population. In Afghanistan, with a population of 30 million, that would work out to about half a million additional troops, not 30,000. Whatever the exact number is, it is clear that to meet the military's own objectives, more installments are in order. All this effort to prop up a corrupt Karzai government that just stole over 1 million votes to keep itself in power as it attempts to control a fraction of the country of Afghanistan.